



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/062,680	02/01/2002	Paul R. Jarko	1992-A	2184

7590 06/04/2004

Joseph A. Sebolt  
SAND & SEBOLT  
Aegis Tower  
4940 Munson St. NW, Suite 1100  
Canton, OH 44718

EXAMINER

VANAMAN, FRANK BENNETT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3618

DATE MAILED: 06/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/062,680

Applicant(s)

JARKO ET AL.

Examiner

Frank Vanaman

Art Unit

3618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/11/04
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 16-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 8, 10, 12 and 17-20 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 4-7, 13, 16 and 21-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9, 11 and 30-32 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **Status of Application**

1. Applicant's amendment, filed March 11, 2004 has been entered in the application. Claims 1-13 and 16-32 are pending.

### **Claim Objections**

2. Claim 22 is objected to because of the following informalities: in claim 22, line 10, "spositioned" should be --positioned--. Appropriate correction is required.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102**

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. Claims 22, 24, 25 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Salmon et al. (US 6,550,792, filed 06/2001). Salmon et al. teach a cart which accommodates at least two recycling containers (70) which have a generally parallelepiped format with downwardly tapering side walls (e.g., fig. 1 -- and inherently understood to have a bottom wall so that they can function as containers), the cart having an upright frame (16, 40, 50, etc.) and including a plurality of vertically arranged and aligned support shelves (42) each of which is taught to be able to accommodate one container (see col. 4, lines 13-15), in a stacked configuration, such that the containers may be slid in and out of the cart (fig. 3), a lid (48) mounted to the top of the cart for movement between an open and closed position, the closed position covering the top of a container (70) when placed on the top most shelf (42) and having a shape which compliments the shape of the container top portions, a pair of wheels (32), and a further receptacle location opposite the shelves (e.g., between 50 and 36) for accommodating newspapers, which extends downwardly from the top of the cart to its base.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Art Unit: 3618

6. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salmon et al. in view of Rauschenberger et al. (EP 0 955 224). The reference to Salmon et al. is discussed above and fails to teach the shelves formed with a plurality of holes.

Rauschenberger et al. teach a cart construction wherein shelves (e.g., 2, 3) are provided with holes (e.g., 17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the shelves of the cart of Salmon et al. with holes as taught by Rauschenberger et al., for the purpose of providing shelves having a lighter weight.

7. Claims 13 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salmon et al. in view of Roman (US 5,707,030). The reference to Salmon et al. is discussed above and fails to teach the cart as having an inverted U-shaped frame formed of metal, and wherein the shelves and containers are formed of a plastic such as polypropylene. As regards the provision of a tubular metal U-shaped frame, the reference to Roman teaches a cart having a pivotable top, wherein the cart includes a U-shaped frame (3) made from tubular metal. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to construct the frame portion of the cart of Salmon et al. (e.g., 16, 52, 50, etc) from a bent U-shaped tubular metal piece such as taught by Roman, for the purpose of providing a rigid frame of lighter weight than the panel styled frame taught by Salmon et al.

As regards the shelves and containers, while Salmon et al. fail to teach the specific material from which they are made, the use of plastics such as polypropylene is old and well known in the manufacturing arts, and as such, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to make the shelves and containers from a plastic material such as polypropylene for the purpose of reducing manufacturing costs.

8. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salmon et al. in view of Toggweiler (CH 310,381). The reference to Salmon et al. is discussed above and fails to teach the side members as including a plurality of holes for allowing

Art Unit: 3618

adjustment of the shelves. Toggweiler teaches a mounting scheme wherein shelves (e.g., 25) may be adjustably mounted on two side members (17) of a cart, in an adjustable fashion, through the use of a plurality of holes (20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a plurality of holes as taught by Toggweiler in the side mounting portions of the cart of Salmon et al., for the purpose of allowing the height of any of the shelves to be adjusted to the user's desire, facilitating flexibility in the objects or containers which may be accommodated therein.

9. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salmon et al. in view of Roman (cited above) and Streit et al. (US 4,319,762). The reference to Salmon et al. fails to teach the lid as having a dome-shape. Roman teaches a cart having a pivotable lid (12) which has a domed profile. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to construct the lid of Salmon et al. to have a dome-shaped profile as taught by Roman for the purpose of providing a stronger molded element and to reduce the tendency of water to pool on the lid top if the cart is used outdoors. The reference to Salmon as modified by Roman fails to teach a latch which engages a container placed below. Streit et al. teach a wheeled cart including a container (4) which may be covered with a pivoting lid (16) which is provided with a latch (25, 26) for engaging the container rim (13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the cart of Salmon et al. as modified by Roman with a latch connected to the lid, for engaging at least one container there-below, as taught by Streit et al., for the purpose of insuring that the lid remains closed, thus limiting casual access.

10. Claims 4-6 and 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salmon et al. in view of Shyshka et al. (CA 2,271,906) and Barnes (US 5,230,282). The previously indicated allowability of claim 5 is withdrawn in view of the new reference to Salmon et al. in combination with the references to Shyshka et al. and Barnes. The reference to Salmon et al. is discussed above and fails to teach the receptacle as

Art Unit: 3618

including a U-shaped metal element with a straight first side, a curved bottom, a second side which terminates in a top end which has an outwardly curved configuration, with the second side being biased towards the first side by the curvature of the bottom.

Shyshka et al. teach a spring steel paper product holding device for a recycling cart, including a U-shaped metal element (550) with a straight first side (551), a curved bottom (553), a second side (555) which terminates in a top end (558) which has an outwardly curved configuration, with the second side being biased towards the first side by the curvature of the bottom. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the receptacle portion of the cart of Salmon et al. with the spring-steel holding device taught by Shyshka et al. for the purpose of positively gripping any items placed therein.

The reference to Salmon et al. as modified by Shyshka et al. fails to specifically teach the receptacle element as including a mesh screen and including a slot through which a cord may be positioned. Barnes teaches a receptacle having first (16) and second (23, 25), outwardly projecting sides, a bottom (e.g., 17) which may be U-shaped (col. 3, lines 39-40), the basket further having slots (e.g., between 23, 25) which allows the passage of cord (34- note also figures 4, 5), a cord container (30) which may be provided with a cutter (col. 4, line 43), wherein both the cord container and the basket itself (see col. 4, line 48 and col. 4, lines 2-5) may be made from a mesh material. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the holder of Shyshka et al. as applied to the cart of Salmon et al. with a mesh structure as taught by Barnes, for the purpose of insuring that the holder can accommodate paper products having a longest dimension which is less than the side-to-side spacing of the elements of the holder of Shyshka et al.

11. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salmon et al. in view Barnes. The reference to Salmon et al. is discussed above and fails to teach the provision of a cord holder and cutter mounted on the lid. Barnes teaches a receptacle which can be used with a cord container (30) which may in turn be provided with a cutter (col. 4, line 43), wherein both the cord container and the basket itself (see

Art Unit: 3618

col. 4, line 48 and col. 4, lines 2-5) may be made from a mesh material. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the cart of Salmon et al. with a cord holder and cutter as taught by Barnes in order to facilitate the bundling and tying-up of recycled paper products.

While the references of Salmon et al. and Barnes fail to specifically teach a particular location for the cord holder, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to locate the holder in an upper most location with respect to the other containers on the cart, and as such, to thusly locate it on the lid, so as to promote easy access to the cord holder and cutter when bundling items.

12. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salmon et al. in view of Streit et al. The reference to Salmon et al. is discussed above and fails to teach a latch on the lid which is configured to engage a container rim. Streit et al. teach a wheeled cart including a container (4) which may be covered with a pivoting lid (16) which is provided with a latch (25, 26) for engaging the container rim (13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the cart of Salmon et al. with a latch connected to the lid, for engaging at least one container there-below, as taught by Streit et al., for the purpose of insuring that the lid remains closed, thus limiting casual access.

#### **Allowable Subject Matter**

13. Claims 1-3, 8, 10, 12, and 17-20 are allowed.

14. Claims 9, 11, and 30-32 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### **Response to Comments**

15. Applicant's comments, filed with the amendment, have been carefully considered. Applicant's comments concerning the reference to Pirelli et al. are noted.

Art Unit: 3618

Note the new reference to Salmon et al., as currently applied in view of applicant's amendments to the claims, taken in combination with applicant's comments.

### Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Bland et al. (US 2,940,707) teach a cart with a cover and a holder which engages the top of a U-shaped cart handle portion.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to F. Vanaman whose telephone number is 703-308-0424. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

As of May 1, 2003, any response to this action should be mailed to:

Mail Stop \_\_\_\_\_  
Commissioner for Patents  
P. O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450,

Or faxed to one of the following fax servers:

Regular Communications/Amendments: 703-872-9326  
After Final Amendments: 703-872-9327  
Customer Service Communications: 703-872-9325

**F. VANAMAN**  
**Primary Examiner**  
**Art Unit 3618**

Handwritten signature of F. Vanaman, dated 5/27/04.